

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/595,630	COLIGNON, CHRISTOPHE
	Examiner BINH Q. TRAN	Art Unit 3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BINH Q. TRAN. (3) _____.

(2) Nicolas Seckel (44,373). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tonetti et al. (Pat. No. 6,666,020).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Binh Q. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Nicolas Seckel presented argument against the rejection based on Tonetti et al.. Specifically, he argued that the control system in Tonetti does not "means for determining a total maximum quantity of fuel accumulating to be injected during post-injections while the engine is idling, on the basis of said temperature". However, the examiner founded the argument non-persuasive as Tonetti still teaches the claimed invention. Applicants will submit an After Amendment. The Examiner will reconsider his position when the amendment is formally submitted. .